

DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

Telephone: 317-232-0570

Facsimile: 317-232-0589

e-mail: [rmarra@doe.in.gov](mailto:rmarra@doe.in.gov)

Meeting of the State Advisory Council on Students with Special Needs

**March 19, 1998  
Holiday Inn, North  
Indianapolis, Indiana**

**In attendance:** Carolyn Heier, Edward Kasamis, Liam Grimley, Michael Dalrymple, Kathy Wodicka, Robert Marra, Brett Bollinger, Deborah Winchester, Mary Ramos, Becky Bowman, Cathlene Hardy-Hansen, Becky Kirk, David Schmidt, Julie Swaim, Maureen Greer, Theresa Willard, Rose Black, Marcia Johnson, Jackie Pitman, and Jeanine Calabria.

Staff Members in Attendance: Gary Collings, ISEAS Project; Sally Cook, Steve Stafford, Lynn Holdheide, and Sharon Knoth, Division of Special Education.

Interpreters: Andy Rork and Becky Noller

Special Guests (a.m.): Maria Sells, Tom Little, JoAnn Willer, Larry Paxson, Eric Rogers, Phil Rupp, Tim Long, and Phil Wray.

The meeting was called to order at 9:37 a.m.

Mrs. Kathy Wodicka, Chair of the Advisory Council explained the process of the open meeting versus a public meeting. Mr. David Schmidt moved to approve the minutes from the February 20, 1998 meeting of the State Advisory Council. Seconded by Mr. Michael Dalrymple. Motion Carried.

Mr. Robert Marra, Secretary of the Advisory Council and Director of the Division of Special Education, distributed information on ISTEP+ and accommodations for students with special needs. Mrs. Mary Ramos asked whether she could share the ISTEP+ information with other parents in her area. She was informed that the document may be widely shared. We will send an up-dated version of the CHARTS OF ACCOMMODATIONS to the Council members (as it has been modified).

Dr. Liam Grimley asked whether the April date for final release of regulations of IDEA '97 was still appropriate. Mr. Marra indicated that at this time, yes. We have not heard anything further with regard to the final regulations and are anticipating them to be distributed within the next 30 calendar days.

Jay-Randolph Special Services Reorganization Request

Mrs. Wodicka asked whether the Council had any questions or concerns regarding the information which was provided to them regarding the Jay-Randolph reorganization proposal. Dr. Brett Bollinger asked whether the legal documents such as the Interlocal or Joint Services agreements had another path to follow "outside" of the Council. Mr. Marra indicated yes and then explained how the Interlocal and Joint Services and Supply agreements are reviewed at the State level.

Tom Little, Superintendent for Jay School Corporation and Mrs. JoAnn Willer, consulting Director of Special Education, provided an overview presentation to the Council members regarding Jay's Comprehensive Plan.

Superintendent Phil Wray provided a presentation for the proposed Greater Randolph Interlocal Cooperative ("GRIC"). This new configuration would incorporate the following school corporations: Randolph Eastern, Randolph Central, Randolph Southern, and Monroe Central.

Mrs. Wodicka asked whether any Council members had questions for either of the presenters. Dr. Grimley asked Randolph County about the additional expenditures which this re-organization will require and whether it would impact or diminish services to special education students. Superintendent Wray and the other Superintendents for GRIC indicated that if it does, it will be out of the general administrative fund and not special education funds and that their respective school boards have been informed of this. Dr. Edward Kasamis asked whether the interim director of special education for Jay County was appropriately licensed. The answer was yes. He then asked whether he was interpreting that parents in the district were split 40% in favor and 60% not in favor of the district re-organization. Mrs. Willer indicated that the question was how the parents would RATE the overall services from the special education program - and that the score of 2.0 on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the very BEST) could not be interpreted as a percentage in the manner which Dr. Kasamis stated. Dr. Grimley asked how many parents were surveyed. Mrs. Willer indicated that this was difficult to ascertain as parents copied and distributed the surveys and the building-level administrator compiled the responses. Dr. Kasamis asked for clarification on expenditures from the \$284,000 allocation for special education. Assistant Superintendent Paxson indicated that the amount was placed in the Joint Services account and that the amount would "roll over" into the special education fund and be used to continue provision of services for special education pupils. He indicated that administrative costs would not go into general fund operations. Mrs. Becky Kirk asked GRIC regarding the number of students being served "outside" of their home school corporation. The answer was the number (3) was referencing court placements and residential placements, and not students being served in Jay County. Mrs. Kirk asked about accessibility of the "new" special services office being proposed. The answer was that they were making every effort to ensure the new special services office is accessible to all. Mrs. Kirk asked about the procedures for additional school corporations wishing to join GRIC. The Superintendents explained the reason they were looking at an Interlocal Agreement vs. a Joint Services and Supply Agreement. Mrs. Kirk asked for clarification regarding the "supervisory" statements on page 33 of their Comprehensive Plan. Superintendent Tim Long will go back and review that page to ensure that it is accurate.

Mrs. Marcia Johnson asked for additional clarification on how Jay School Corporation obtained parental and staff input on the survey. Mrs. Willer provided additional information. Mrs. Johnson

then asked for elaboration on procedures for hiring the additional staff members for whom they have indicated they will have vacancies. Mrs. Willer indicated that as always, special education teachers are difficult to obtain, but they will make every effort to seek out personnel from IHEs throughout the state. Mrs. Johnson then asked GRIC regarding procedures for identifying and hiring vacated staff positions. The Superintendents explained how they would seek out the necessary staff members.

Dr. Bollinger asked Jay School Corporation regarding the private/parochial school listed within their attendance area. Are there procedures in place to include their staff in training and procedures? Superintendent Little provided an update for Dr. Bollinger. Dr. Bollinger then asked for clarification on the Petition for Local Responsibility - there are "zeros" for staff in transportation needs, is that because there are no transportation needs? Superintendent Little indicated that all students are bused and served in their home district so there are no additional costs. Dr. Bollinger asked GRIC to elaborate on the early childhood/preschool services they provide. Superintendent Wray provided an update on how they currently provide services. Superintendent Rupp gave an update of how they will be hiring an individual who will coordinate the preschool services for GRIC. Dr. Bollinger asked for clarification on page 3 of the plan regarding personnel needs. The Superintendents indicated that this would most likely be one person who would be director, coordinator of early childhood, and coordinator of transition services.

Mrs. Deborah Winchester asked GRIC regarding OT, PT and other related services. The answer was they currently contract for those services from an outside source.

Dr. Kasamis asked GRIC regarding salary schedule changes. The Comprehensive Plan indicated that each district has a different pay scale. The Superintendents indicated that this still has not been finalized. They are negotiating contract and salary schedules for Interlocal personnel. Other than the director and the secretary they anticipate there will only be four (4) people who will be employed by the Interlocal. A question of how many will be "RIFed" [Reduction In Force] arose. Although there will technically be 8 employees "RIFed", four will be assumed by Jay and four will be assumed by GRIC - so technically speaking, there is no "real" reduction in force (providing they all accept the new job offers).

Mrs. Cathlene Hardy-Hansen asked Jay to provide her with a succinct reason as to why they wanted out of the Cooperative Agreement. Superintendent Little indicated that the impetus was local control and how Jay can best meet the needs of the families and students who reside in Jay County. His exact statements were: "The result will be three fold: building based opportunities for growth, a service delivery model that provides for the development of inter-agency linkages of Title I, At-Risk, Prime Time, Reading Recovery, Health Services, as well as Social Services which are configured in a county-wide structure, and a local director whose office will be located right down the hall." Mrs. Hardy-Hansen then asked for clarification regarding related services for Jay. Superintendent Little indicated that OT/PT are provided on a contractual basis. Mrs. Willer indicated that the services which are currently listed are only those services determined as needed for students - if there is something "missing" it is only because there isn't currently a student in that particular building who needs the related service. Mrs. Hardy-Hansen then asked about the numbers of paraprofessionals available in the buildings and what their

roles/responsibilities are. Mrs. Willer and Superintendent Little gave an update on how paraprofessionals are deemed necessary for students within Jay County. It is determined by the student's case conference committee and the paraprofessional is assigned to the student, not the classroom.

Mrs. Maureen Greer asked both Jay and GRIC to explain the procedures for providing early childhood transition services (birth to three transition to Part B) and the transition from Part B to adulthood. The Superintendents gave clarification regarding that the current procedures will continue to be followed.

Mr. Dalrymple asked Jay County to clarify the cluster site and what its purpose will be. It is an elementary school which was selected because there were classrooms in the building which were not being utilized. Some of their elementary buildings are open concept buildings (without walls) and some students struggle in this set-up so the cluster site has actual classrooms which will be available for students. Mrs. Kirk asked whether this would be for all students or elementary only. Superintendent Little indicated that this is for elementary-level students only. Mr. Dalrymple asked whether all students would be eligible for the cluster site or only specific disability areas. Superintendent Little indicated it would be open to all.

Mr. Schmidt asked what was meant by EC in Jay's Plan. Superintendent Little indicated that EC stood for Early Childhood. Mr. Schmidt then expressed his own personal dissatisfaction with how this re-organization came about. He stressed that he was speaking on his own and not on behalf of the Council. He commended both parties on their plans but wanted it on the record that he did not like WHY this came about. Dr. Grimley, Dr. Kasamis, and Mrs. Kirk concurred.

Mrs. Rose Black asked Jay County a question regarding the survey on page 13. What is meant by more appropriate services and less inclusion time? She is concerned about the statement of "less inclusion time." Mrs. Willer indicated that this was a direct quote from the parents. It appears to stem more from the appropriate intervention needs of students. Mrs. Black expressed her concerns regarding a cluster not being a least restrictive environment for students. She then asked what Jay would be doing to embrace students with special needs into the general population. Mr. Dalrymple read this and also had some concerns. Mrs. Willer explained that the students are included. Mr. Dalrymple stated he believed the parent might have meant that the inclusion services which are currently there are not adequately provided. He indicated it might be indicative of parental belief that students are not necessarily receiving the proper support in inclusion settings.

Mrs. Black asked a question regarding the 3rd paragraph on page 17 - is that a typographical error? Mrs. Willer indicated that this has to do with staff travel routes and how caseloads might be distributed more equitably.

Mrs. Theresa Willard asked questions regarding staff training needs as specified in the survey. Superintendent Little gave some updates to the Council regarding staff training and how the sessions will be determined as well as provided. The training would be offered to all staff members, not just special education staff. Mrs. Willard then asked which programs are not currently "county-wide" in Jay County. Superintendent Little indicated he was not aware, at this

time, of any program which was not available county-wide. Mrs. Willard requested clarification on how disputes with the cluster sites would be resolved. Superintendent Little provided some additional information regarding how cluster sites are determined and the alternatives available from which families may select. Mrs. Willard then asked for physical and space accommodations which will be afforded students in the cluster site. Superintendent Little explained that there is no one categorical answer. It will be structured based on each child's needs as determined by his or her case conference committee. Mrs. Willard expressed her concerns regarding the use of a concept such as a "cluster site" and the potential ramifications it may have on families in the district. Superintendent Little indicated that at this time, they do not have written procedures in this area as it has not been an issue. If it should become an issue, then they would need to develop written procedures.

Mrs. Julie Swaim voiced concerns regarding the "less inclusion time" statement as it pertains to reading comprehension, remediation, and ISTEP. She also expressed a desire for Jay County to keep in mind the need to ensure training activities are for all staff and not just pulling out this person or that person for a given topic. Mrs. Willer gave an update on how training activities are selected and offered.

Mrs. Carolyn Heier asked GRIC for clarification on where the director will be physically located. The Superintendents indicated that it would be within a 10-mile radius of each of the districts. She then commented that the survey of "satisfaction of services" would appear to indicate that parents, general educators and special educators are, for the most part, satisfied with the services they are receiving. She asked for clarification regarding expenditures for special education staff. Superintendent Little indicated there is an anticipated increase in costs.

Mrs. Kirk asked whether the Division will be monitoring or keeping the Council up-dated on Jay County's progress regarding the goals they have set for the 1998/99 school year. Mr. Marra indicated that some of this will be incorporated into the SIP and SIG process which the Division will be presenting to the Council tomorrow. The Division is looking at revamping the monitoring process - looking more at performance indicators. Those goals which fall into the Division's goals will be monitored by the Division. If there are goals which are not a part of the Division's goals for the State Improvement Plan ("SIP"), then the answer would be no.

Dr. Kasamis made a motion that the Council take this matter under advisement and be provided an opportunity to vote on this issue for tomorrow morning's 9:00 a.m. meeting. Seconded by Mr. Schmidt. Motion carried.

The Council took a break for lunch.

Special Guests (p.m.): Cheryl Harshman, Director of Special Education for West Central Indiana Special Services; David Shaw, Director of Special Education for North Montgomery Community School Corporation; Dennis Renshaw, Superintendent for North Montgomery Community Schools; Craig Glen, Superintendent for Crawfordsville Community Schools; Mr. Lake, School Board Member for Attica, and Bob Baker, Superintendent for Southeast Fountain Schools.

Superintendent Renshaw addressed the Council and gave an overview of the reason North Montgomery would like to withdraw from the Special Services Cooperative. They convened a Board Retreat this past summer. The GOALS which came out of the meeting they convened were: Promoting a Sense of Community, Communication throughout our Community, and Evaluation of Personnel. Mr. Shaw then approached the Council and gave an overview of current special education services within North Montgomery. He discussed services and goals they have set for their program in the coming years.

Mrs. Harshman provided a presentation for the Council on behalf of West Central Indiana Special Services Cooperative (basically an overview/condensed version of what was submitted to the Council within their Comprehensive Plan).

Mr. Schmidt asked for an explanation on the fiscal impact of North Montgomery's withdrawal from the Cooperative. Mrs. Harshman indicated that North Montgomery currently pays \$132,000, if it were to be removed the "excess" would be evenly divided among the remaining corporations. The one school psychologist which would be "eliminated" could be "absorbed" by North Montgomery. Superintendent Glen gave Mr. Schmidt an overview of what the costs for the remaining districts would become. The four RIFed employees would be a psychologist, a consultant, and 2 additional employees. Mr. Schmidt asked for an explanation of what North Montgomery "gets" for their \$132,203.43 that they put in towards the Cooperative's current budget. Mrs. Harshman indicated the services are: consultative services for OT, a school psychologist, and the "expertise" of the Cooperative's director of special education. They also "get" the services of the secretarial/support staff for the Cooperative and the expertise of the consultants and preschool coordinators. Although they aren't in need of these services at this time, they are available for them at will or at need. Superintendent Renshaw indicated that the impact for North Montgomery was analyzed in cooperation with Mrs. Harshman. They currently have a coordinator for special education (Turkey Run does as well). Superintendent Renshaw indicated that it is their estimate that all they will "need" is to hire a school psychologist.

Mr. Schmidt asked for some input from the Superintendents who are in attendance. Discussions ensued from all parties involved.

There will be an anticipated need to add an elementary level program for one (1) student with a moderate mental impairment. That is why the chart indicates that there will be an anticipated need for one (1) teacher of students with moderate mental impairments. North Montgomery has approximately 1/6 the total special education populations for the Cooperative. Mr. Dalrymple expressed concern that parents were not involved until last week. Did they truly involve them and gain their input? North Montgomery responded that through the process they have had at least 3 public Board Meetings where parents were in attendance, as well as communications with teachers throughout the system. In their opinion, it was not a "last minute" involvement of families, it has been on-going.

Mrs. Kirk asked about the involvement of a Parent Advisory Council for the Corporation. The answer was there is not one for the Corporation nor for the Cooperative. North Montgomery's December 1, 1997 Count for special education is 312 (unduplicated). A discussion of what will

"happen" with the one student at the elementary level who has a moderate mental impairment ensued.

Mrs. Wodicka asked for clarification on a 5-year plan for each of the "districts". Where do they see themselves in 5 years if the Council permits this re-organization to go forth? Mr. Shaw indicated that although they will be an "independent provider" they would still envision themselves sharing students between and among neighboring school corporations. It is not North Montgomery's belief that you have to be in a Cooperative to share services. The Cooperative responded by stating that their long-range plan provides for services for students. Their plan is to strive to ensure that continuity and quality of services continues on.

Mrs. Heier asked whether the North Montgomery Schools and/or the Cooperative have ever conducted a survey to "rate" parental satisfaction with special education services. No surveys have been conducted. She asked what fiscal increases are anticipated. Mr. Shaw indicated that early childhood is an area where they anticipate there will be an increase in enrollment. No one can ever state for sure what future enrollments will be. Their philosophy is "Child First" and that students should be in "regular" classes. Mrs. Heier asked how each "party" believes students will be better off with the reorganization should the Council approve such move. Mrs. Harshman indicated that the programs they have in the Cooperative will remain intact regardless of what the Council approves or disapproves. The only reduction will be in Cooperative staff - programs will remain the same, and be improved upon. Mr. Shaw indicated that North Montgomery will have personnel available within their own school corporation as needs arise. Currently, they have to "wait" until the consultant is available to come to their district to provide the services.

Dr. Kasamis stated that, if he understands North Montgomery's presentation, they believe they can add 7 new positions with the \$132,000 they currently pay into the Cooperative. Superintendent Renshaw indicated it is not actually 7 positions. Some of the positions are currently contracted for. Dr. Kasamis asked for Mrs. Harshman's opinion regarding whether students will benefit or be "hurt" by the proposal here today. Mrs. Harshman indicated that since she was hired, the vision of the Cooperative has been to move towards local services (basically away from the consultant and itinerant model). They are still moving that direction. She believes the Council would have to ask parents in the district as to whether they believe it will be of benefit or harm to students. Superintendent Renshaw stated that fiscal interests should be left to the discretion of his Board. If they are willing to fund the services, it is in the benefit of the students involved and not of interest to the Council. Dr. Kasamis re-stated his question to Mrs. Harshman. She indicated that if North Montgomery has everything "in place", then "Yes" they will be able to provide services to students.

Mrs. Johnson re-stated what she believes both sides "agree" to regarding the re-structuring. She indicated that the Council can't be looking at the BEST program available, it must look at whether each can provide a Free and Appropriate Public Education for all of the students involved.

Mr. Schmidt asked, if they "lose" their consultants through the Cooperative, how many new people will North Montgomery have to hire in order to implement the IEPs in the districts. A full time DSE, a school psychologist, an early childhood person, 2 paraprofessionals for the middle

and elementary level, a part-time teacher of students with Emotional Impairments, a teacher of students with a Visual Impairment (probably not full time). Mr. Schmidt indicated that his district where he currently works is approximately the same size as North Montgomery. He is having difficulty envisioning what services will "remain." Mr. Shaw indicated that this is because they have no idea of which students will even be there next year. Mrs. Black indicated that she also had a question regarding the vagueness of the projections for staff members. Superintendent Renshaw indicated that the \$132,000 they pay for special education is actually more like \$192,000 once they figure in their local costs. The Cooperative of the "future", in his opinion, is changing. They currently have an alternative school which permits students from other corporations to attend programs therein. They didn't need a Cooperative agreement to permit this.

Mrs. Black asked for input from North Montgomery as to how they can assure the Council that they can provide for 2 students who may move into the district over the summer. Superintendent Renshaw indicated that no one can predict what will happen if someone should suddenly move into a district. It is very difficult to predict how one will handle such situations. Mrs. Black then asked who chairs case conferences for North Montgomery? Mr. Shaw does currently, if the Council approves this request, it would most likely be the Director - or perhaps the building principals.

Mrs. Hardy-Hansen asked for clarification from the Cooperative regarding the preschool program information they have provided. What is Even-Start? It is a Crawfordsville program for children from birth to age 5, available to children in need (not special education specific). Mrs. Hardy-Hansen asked whether all preschool programs have typical-aged peers in them. The answer was yes. A discussion on the academic programs available for students with special needs ensued. Mr. Shaw indicated that it is a case conference committee decision.

Dr. Grimley expressed his opinions both in favor and in opposition to the proposal before the Council. Superintendent Renshaw clarified that North Montgomery is moving toward a more "locally controlled" supervisory set-up. He does not see an agreement lasting indefinitely. Furthermore, no one has considered the revenue or funding that is currently "going to the Cooperative" which, if the Council approves the re-structuring, would "come back" to North Montgomery. Those dollars have not been shown in the graphics provided. When you start adding all of those dollars together, it is definitely more than \$132,000.

Mr. Marra asked whether the APC is flowing to the school corporations. The answer was Yes. He then asked whether the special education funding flows to the local education agency. Yes. The Cooperative "bills" each LEA for services they receive.

Mrs. Kirk asked if something should happen in the future, and North Montgomery wanted "back in" to a Cooperative, what is the process? Mr. Marra indicated that it would be similar to what is occurring here today, except they would be asking the Council to approve the merger.

Mrs. Wodicka explained that the Council would vote on this request first thing tomorrow morning. She explained the process available to each side should they disagree with the



Council's decision. Mrs. Jackie Pitman moved that the Council meeting be adjourned. Seconded by Mrs. Swaim. The Council meeting was adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

**March 20, 1998**

**Day 2**

**State Advisory Council Meeting**

**In Attendance:** David Schmidt, Becky Kirk, Cathlene Hardy-Hansen, Becky Bowman, Mary Ramos, Brett Bollinger, Jackie Pitman, Robert Marra, Kathy Wodicka, Michael Dalrymple, Liam Grimley, Edward Kasamis, Carolyn Heier, Theresa Willard, Marcia Johnson, Deborah Winchester, Julie Swaim, Maureen Greer, Rose Black, and Jeanine Calabria.

Staff Members in Attendance: Sally Cook, Steve Stafford, Lynn Holdheide, and Sharon Knoth.

Interpreters: Andy Rork and Becky Noller

Special Guests: Maria Sells, Dalonda Young, and Dave Shaw.

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m.

Mrs. Wodicka asked the Council how they would like to proceed with the Comprehensive Plans which were presented yesterday. Dr. Kasamis moved that the Council move towards making every effort in seeking a resolution on the presentations given yesterday. Seconded by Mrs. Hardy-Hansen. Motion approved.

Dr. Grimley moved that the Council go ahead and approve the Greater Randolph Interlocal Cooperative ("GRIC") Plan. Seconded by Mr. Schmidt. Mrs. Wodicka asked whether this included Jay County's. Dr. Grimley stated "No". Mrs. Hardy-Hansen indicated some discomfort with the statement in the Plan from Jay County which indicated that parents "wanted less inclusion." When she went up to Mrs. Willer at lunch she asked whether the parents included both general education and special education parents and was told "Yes". Mrs. Hardy-Hansen indicated that she believes the Council was being mis-led as the Jay School Corporation misrepresented the "true" special education parental input to the Council. Mrs. Johnson concurred with what Mrs. Hardy-Hansen stated. Mrs. Johnson was also concerned with the low number of parents who were interviewed, but as she reflected on this last night she believes that parents, if they were opposed, would have been vocal in other venues (School Board meetings, telephone calls to the Division of Special Education, etc.). Mr. Marra indicated that he is not aware of any telephone calls coming in to the Division from parents of special needs students in Jay County. Mrs. Kirk commented on this issue as well. Mr. Schmidt indicated that in his opinion, the Council should not place a value judgement on whether 13 parents were "enough" parents or not. Mrs. Willard indicated that she disagreed with Mr. Schmidt. She believes that Jay County did not make an effort to reach out to parents of students with special needs and almost blatantly mis-led the Council in representing parental input (or lack thereof). Mrs. Greer spoke to this issue as well. She elaborated on the fact that there is more than one way to obtain parental input (other than just a survey). What Mrs. Greer wanted to know is how this would make things better for students and families - and what she heard is that it won't. This is strictly a fiscal issue

and came about because "they could not play together" per se. The re-organization will actually result in an increase in administrative costs and they can say it won't affect services to students because it will affect some students - maybe not special education students, but a child will be affected. Mrs. Winchester also expressed concerns regarding the "inclusion" statements in the plan. She also indicated that in her opinion, most parents aren't going to be involved in the re-organization of a cooperative - their interests are focused on services for their son or daughter.

Mr. Marra spoke to the Council regarding the "monitoring" aspect - how the Division will go about ensuring FAPE is provided to all students. All districts in the state will be monitored next year (because of the Reauthorization of IDEA '97) and in his opinion, we won't see massive changes this first year (should the Council approve the re-organization). He also stated that the Division can build something into the Petition for Local Responsibility which brings parental involvement "more strongly into the picture." Another component for the Petition for Local Responsibility might be a small "team" from the Division which would go out and visit the district - looking for specific components (parental involvement as well as teacher and building level staff opinions).

Mrs. Swaim commented on the parental involvement aspect as well. Many parents are hesitant to speak up regarding their opinions for fear of retaliation toward their children. Dr. Grimley expressed his current stance as to how he felt last year when the proposal initially came before the Council vs. this year. Mr. Dalrymple stated his beliefs regarding the GRIC Plan and how it might be implemented. He asked that the Council "trust" the system - the Division as well as due process will work towards correcting the course of direction. Mrs. Black expressed concerns as to whether the parents in Jay County have ever really "seen" inclusion - not clusters - inclusion. Are clusters Jay County's only option for students with unique needs? The separation has already occurred, we need to provide support to Jay to ensure that the separation agreement is followed through appropriately. Mrs. Jeanine Calabria spoke about inclusion and moving forward with that philosophy. Mrs. Johnson expressed concerns with the Council's criticism of Jay's parental involvement when GRIC didn't even indicate having obtained parental input. Mrs. Kirk requested Mr. Marra to entertain the possibility of monitoring these districts annually for the next 3 years to ensure that the Comprehensive Plans are implemented. Mrs. Hardy-Hansen asked Mr. Marra to share with GRIC the Council's concern over the lack of parental input towards the Plan. Mrs. Wodicka called for a vote on the motion to approve GRIC's Comprehensive Plan. Motion approved 17 to 1. Carried.

Dr. Kasamis moved that the Council advise Jay County that we are opposed to the Plan in its current format. Seconded by Dr. Grimley. Mr. Schmidt asked what was believed to be missing in Jay's plan. The response of the business manager regarding the effect on the General Fund is lacking in foresight. In his opinion, the fiscal impact was not addressed adequately. Dr. Kasamis also stated that he did not believe that the "hired" Director who already has a full-time job, could adequately address the Plan and what was being proposed to the Council. He would like to see a more detailed Plan. The size of the Jay School Corporation is another issue. Seven teachers, in a large district may not have a severe impact, but in one the size of Jay County it can. Mrs. Greer concurred with the inadequacy of the fiscal impact study. Mrs. Johnson expressed concerns regarding the Council's questioning Jay's fiscal study when GRIC didn't have anything mentioned in its Plan regarding fiscal impact. The Council must be fair and equitable. If we are

going to question one district's fiscal study, then we need to question the other district's fiscal study. Dr. Bollinger shared the concerns Council members expressed. However, he questioned whether fiscal impact is truly a part of a Comprehensive Plan. In his district, fiscal impact is not a part of his Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Marra concurred that fiscal impact is not a component of a Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan looks at how services will be delivered within the district(s) involved. Mrs. Wodicka called for a vote on the Council's denying Jay School Corporation's Comprehensive Plan as submitted. The vote was 8 in favor, 10 opposed. Motion defeated.

Mr. Schmidt moved to approve the Plan as submitted by Jay School Corporation. Seconded by Mrs. Johnson. Mrs. Wodicka called for a vote on the Council's approving Jay School Corporation's Comprehensive Plan as it was submitted. The vote was 10 in favor, 8 opposed. Motion carried.

Mrs. Kirk made a motion that the correspondence which is forwarded to each of the parties indicate that the vote was close as there were concerns expressed by Council members. Seconded by Mrs. Swaim. Motion carried.

Dr. Kasamis had to leave the meeting for another appointment. Mr. Shaw from North Montgomery joined the Council meeting.

The Council turned its attention to the West Central Indiana Special Education Cooperative and North Montgomery Schools petitions. Mr. Dalrymple moved that the Council disapprove North Montgomery's Comprehensive Plan (and thereby disallow their withdrawal from West Central Indiana Special Education Cooperative). Seconded by Dr. Grimley. Mr. Schmidt spoke in favor of the motion and expressed concerns regarding North Montgomery's lack of concrete knowledge regarding staffing and fiscal needs which will arise as a result of the split. Dr. Grimley also spoke in favor of the motion, expressing concerns over the lack of "comprehensiveness" contained within North Montgomery's Comprehensive Plan. They have failed to address the needs of low incidence services and programs. Mrs. Willard expressed her thoughts regarding the "spirit" and "intent" of North Montgomery's Comprehensive Plan. She believes their intent is in the right place. Mrs. Winchester expressed concerns regarding the staffing issues (or lack of attention to staffing issues) in North Montgomery's Plan. Dr. Bollinger spoke to Superintendent Renshaw's concern and caring attitudes towards students. He has worked with Superintendent Renshaw in the past and Dr. Bollinger believes that he has the best interest in students at heart. If he were to vote for approving such a request, Dr. Bollinger would like to add a clause that the Division will monitor the district in 2 years to ensure that the intent of the Comprehensive Plan is being fulfilled. Mrs. Swaim spoke towards the issue of accountability when Cooperative Programs don't work. It is difficult for parents, and the structure of the Cooperative sometimes does not lend itself to friendly resolution of disputes. Mrs. Johnson spoke to the issue of "friendly departures" and the possibility for transfer tuition to address some of the "low incidence" programming. Mr. Dalrymple spoke to the size of the current Cooperative arrangement, in his opinion it is currently too large. However, splitting just one corporation out of it does not lend itself to "righting the size." He does not believe that a district of such small size as North Montgomery can fulfill the duties they have outlined in their Comprehensive Plan. There are not enough fiscal and personnel resources and previous districts

of this size who have attempted to "go it alone" have failed. A discussion on the size of the Cooperative and the lack of attention to services for students in low incidence areas ensued. Mrs. Willard asked if there were any problems or difficulties in provision of services as they are currently provided by the Cooperative. Mrs. Swaim indicated that the presenters for North Montgomery did indicate that the consultants being a good distance away does cause some difficulties for students. Mrs. Wodicka called for a vote to dis-allow the break from the Cooperative. 8 in favor. 9 opposed. Motion defeated.

Mrs. Willard moved to approve North Montgomery's Comprehensive Plan. Seconded by Mrs. Calabria. Mr. Dalrymple expressed his concerns regarding the potential lack of services for students and due process procedures and the amount of time which will elapse. He expressed concern for services to students and the lack thereof which might occur. Mrs. Winchester and Dr. Grimley concurred with Mr. Dalrymple and elaborated on how this will affect the students who are in low incidence areas as well as how parents are going to perceive this re-structuring. Mrs. Kirk expressed her concern regarding the lack of preparation in North Montgomery's Plan to address the needs of students with severe disabilities. Mrs. Wodicka called for a vote. The vote was 7 in favor. 8 opposed. Motion denied.

Dr. Grimley made a motion to dis-approve North Montgomery's withdrawal from West Central Indiana Special Education Cooperative. Seconded by Mr. Schmidt. Mrs. Willard expressed concerns that the Council is "sacrificing" the needs of all because of one or two students. Is the Council looking at the overall needs of students within North Montgomery? Mrs. Kirk indicated that although it is one student at this time, it will eventually be others - either from students moving into a district or identification of students over the coming years. Mrs. Becky Bowman asked what it is that the Council wants to see in North Montgomery's Comprehensive Plan? What is it about the Plan which the Council finds unacceptable? Are we applying the same standard to all Comprehensive Plans that are being brought before the Council? Mr. Dalrymple indicated that a Plan on paper looks one way, and although they can say they will provide services, they aren't currently. Currently they need assistance to provide services, and he believes they will need assistance in the future as well. Dr. Bollinger reminded the Council that it is an ADVISORY Council. Mr. Marra ultimately has to make the final decision. If he decides to make them re-submit, he will need to tell them exactly what it is that is "missing" or "lacking" in the current Plan. Mrs. Wodicka called for a vote. The vote was 9 in favor. 7 opposed. 1 Absentia. Motion carried. Dr. Grimley asked that when Mr. Marra does notify the district of the Council's decision, he also explain to them that the Council found North Montgomery's efforts to be moving in the right direction.

#### Overview of State Improvement Plan and State Improvement Grant

Ms. Sharon Knoth with the Division of Special Education shared an initial draft of the State Improvement Plan ("SIP") for Council members to review. This is required in order for us to receive our Part B special education funding. In looking at the Goals, the SIP Committee began with the initial goals of the National Goals 2000 Project, merged goal 5 from the National Goals into Goal 3 - thus resulting in seven (7) goals for the SIP. The Indiana State Board of Education has six overall goals which are part of their mission. The SIP Committee believes that the State Board of Education's goals overarch the 7 goals delineated within the SIP.

The Division would appreciate input from Council members by April 1 regarding any omission in goals or performance indicators. It is important to remember this is a systems change process and many of the other state agencies must be involved with the SIP. That is why Council members will notice some of the performance indicators have nothing to do with school buildings or corporations per se. Please review the initial draft of the SIP and forward your comments to Ms. Knoth by April 1, 1998. The Council will most likely receive 2 additional drafts of this document prior to the next Council meeting.

#### Next Advisory Council Meeting

Mr. Marra asked the Council for input for attendance at a June 12, 1998 meeting. By show of hands, the majority of Council members indicated they would be available to attend. It will most likely start at 9:00 a.m. and will be at the Embassy Suites North. At that meeting, Mr. Marra will attempt to provide Council members with an advanced calendar for meetings for the 1998/99 school year.

Mr. Marra thanked the Council members for their time and willingness to help make the tough types of decisions which have been before them during the past two days.

Mrs. Swaim moved to adjourn the Council Meeting. Seconded by Mr. Dalrymple. Motion Carried.

Meeting adjourned at 12:47 p.m.